

S/N: 10/690,556  
Art Unit: 2162

8

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

1-Oct-06  
Atty. Dkt.:2694/24

**OCT 02 2006**REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-39 are in this case. Claims 1-39 have been rejected under § 103(a). Independent claim 1 has been amended. Claims 7 and 39 have been canceled, without prejudice.

§ 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-39 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stark (US Publication No. 2002/0007446) in view of Sedgewick, "Algorithms in C++", pages 231-243, Addison Wesley (1992). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

While continuing to traverse the Examiner's rejections, the Applicant has, in order to expedite the prosecution, chosen to amend independent claim 1 in order to clarify and emphasize the crucial distinctions between the present invention and the combined teachings of Stark and Sedgewick as cited by the Examiner. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended with the limitation of dependent claim 7 to clarify that the search is a pre-determined search. The term "pre-determined search" was defined in the instant Specification as referring to "a search within a node (in the case of a search tree structure) or a list, in which the amount of data required to perform the search is pre-determined, i.e., can be calculated in advance" (page 54).

This definition would appear to exclude the hashing techniques taught by Sedgewick.

S/N: 10/690,556  
Art Unit: 2162

9

1-Oct-06  
Atty. Dkt.:2694/24

With regard to independent claim 21, independent claim 1 recites "performing a deterministic search within said at least one node of said search-tree structure". As defined in the instant Specification (page 54). This definition would appear to exclude the binary-tree methods cited by the Examiner, which do not enable such a deterministic search. Thus, the fact that Stark teaches a deterministic search is immaterial, because combining binary-tree methods with the teachings of Stark, as articulated by the Examiner, would destroy the deterministic search capabilities of Stark. Hence, these references are not properly combinable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6, and 7-38 are in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Mark M. Friedman  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 33,883

Date: October 1, 2006